



Detailed California-Modified GREET Pathway for Brazilian Sugar Cane Ethanol

Stationary Source Division
Release Date: January 12, 2009
Version 2.0

The Staff of the Air Resources Board developed this preliminary draft version as part of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Regulatory Process

The ARB acknowledges contributions from the California Energy Commission, TIAX, and Life Cycle Associates during the development of this document

When reviewing this document, please submit comments directly to:

Anil Prabhu: aprabhu@arb.ca.gov

Chan Pham: cpham@arb.ca.gov

Alan Glabe: aqlabe@arb.ca.gov

These comments will be compiled, reviewed, and posted to the LCFS website in a timely manner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	i
List of Figures.....	ii
List of Tables.....	iii
SUMMARY	1
CA-GREET Model Pathway for Brazil Sugar Cane Ethanol.....	2
WTT Details	7
TTW Details	12
APPENDIX A.....	13
Section 1. SUGAR CANE FARMING.....	15
1.1 Energy Use for Sugar Cane Farming	16
1.2 GHG Emissions from Sugar Cane Farming	19
1.3 GHG Emissions from Straw Burning in Field.....	22
Section 2. CHEMICAL INPUTS FOR AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS	25
2.1 Energy Calculations for Production of Chemical Inputs	26
2.2 GHG Calculation from Production and Use of Agricultural Chemicals	27
Section 3. SUGAR CANE TRANSPORT	32
3.1 Energy for Sugar Cane Transportation.....	33
3.2 GHG Calculations from Sugar Cane Transportation	33
Section 4. ETHANOL PRODUCTION.....	35
4.1 Ethanol Production.....	36
4.2 GHG Emissions from Ethanol Production	37
Section 5. ETHANOL TRANSPORT AND DISTRIBUTION	40
5.1 Energy for Ethanol Transportation and Distribution.....	41
5.2 GHG Calculations from Ethanol Transportation and Distribution	43
APPENDIX B.....	46
Ethanol Pathway Input Values	46

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 1. WTW Components for Sugar Cane Ethanol Produced in Brazil and Transported for Use in CA.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Figure 2. Percent Energy Contribution from WTW for Sugar Cane Ethanol.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Figure 3. Percent GHG Contributions from WTW for Sugar Cane Ethanol.....</i>	<i>6</i>

LIST OF TABLES

Table A. Sugar Cane Ethanol Energy Use	5
Table B. GHG Emissions Summary for Sugar Cane Ethanol.....	6
Table C. Total Energy Input by Fuel Use for Sugar Cane Farming	7
Table D. GHG Emissions from Sugar Cane Farming and Straw Burning.....	7
Table E. Energy Inputs for Agricultural Chemicals for Sugar Cane Farming.....	8
Table F. Total GHG Emissions from Agricultural Chemical Use	8
Table G. Sugar Cane Transport Energy.....	9
Table H. Sugar Cane Transport – Total GHG Emissions	9
Table I. Ethanol Production Energy Use	10
Table J. GHG Emissions for Ethanol Production.....	10
Table K. Energy Use for Ethanol Transport and Distribution (T&D)	11
Table L. GHG Emissions Related to Ethanol Transport	11
Table 1.01. Primary Energy Inputs by Fuel/Energy Input Type for Farm Operations	16
Table 1.02. Primary Energy Inputs by Fuel/Energy Input Type for Farm Operations	17
Table 1.03. Calculating Total Energy Input by Fuel for Sugar Cane Cultivation.....	17
Table 1.04. Values Used in Table 1.03	18
Table 1.05. Energy Consumption in the WTT Process and Specific Energy.....	19
Table 1.06. Global Warming Potentials for Gases	19
Table 1.07. GREET Calculations for CO ₂ Emissions from Sugar Cane Farming	20
Table 1.08. Input Values for Calculations in Table 1.06	21
Note: The calculations for CH ₄ and N ₂ O are analogous.....	21
Table 1.09. GHG Emissions from Sugar Cane Farming.....	22
Table 1.10 Inputs for Calculating Field Burning Emissions	22
Table 1.11 Sugar Cane Straw Burning Emission Factors	22
The same notes under Table 1.09 apply for this table.....	23
Table 1.12 Sugar Cane Straw Burning Emissions.....	23
Table 2.01. Sugar Cane Farming Chemical Inputs	26
Table 2.02. Calculated GHG Emissions (g/g) Associated with Production of Agricultural Chemicals	27
Table 2.03. Calculated CO ₂ Emissions Associated with Production of Agricultural Chemicals	28
Table 2.04. Calculated GHG Emissions (g/g) Associated with Production of Agricultural Chemicals	28
Table 2.05. Calculated GHG Emissions from Production of Agricultural Chemicals	29
Table 2.06. Inputs and Calculated Emissions for Soil NO and N ₂ O from Sugar Cane Farming.....	29
Table 2.07. Total GHG Emissions from Agricultural Chemical Use for Sugar Cane Ethanol.....	30
Table 3.01. Sugar cane Transport Inputs.....	33
Table 3.02. Sugar Cane Transport Energy.....	33
Table 3.03. Key Assumptions in Calculating GHG Emissions from Sugar Cane.....	34
Table 3.04. Sugar Cane Transport - CO ₂ Emissions in g/mmBtu.....	34
Table 3.05. Sugar Cane Transport – Other GHG Emissions.....	34

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

<i>Table 4.01. Sugar Cane Ethanol Fuel Shares and Primary Energy Inputs (Btu/gallon Anhydrous Ethanol).....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Table 4.02. Sugar Cane Ethanol Formulas, Parameters and Total Energy.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Table 4.03. Process Shares and Emission Factors (EF) of Ethanol Production.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Table 4.04. Calculated GHG Emissions for Ethanol Production Using CO₂ Factors from Table 4.03</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Table 5.01. Inputs and Calculated Energy Requirements for Ethanol Transport to Bulk Terminals</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Table 5.02. GREET Calculations for Ethanol Transport Energy (Btu/mmBtu Anhydrous Ethanol) by Transport Mode</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Table 5.03. Key Assumptions in Calculating GHG Emissions from EtOH Transportation</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Table 5.04. EtOH Transport and Distribution - CO₂e Emissions in g/mmBtu</i>	<i>44</i>

SUMMARY

CA-GREET Model Pathway for Brazil Sugar Cane Ethanol

A Well-To-Tank (WTT) life cycle analysis of a fuel (or blending component of fuel) pathway includes all steps from feedstock production to final finished product. Tank-To-Wheel (TTW) analysis includes actual combustion of fuel in a motor vehicle for motive power. Together WTT and TTW analysis are combined together to provide a total Well-To-Wheel (WTW) analysis.

A life cycle analysis model called the **G**reenhouse gases, **R**egulated **E**missions, and **E**nergy use in **T**ransportation (GREET)¹ developed by Argonne National Laboratory has been used to estimate the energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the production of ethanol from Brazilian sugar cane. The ethanol is then transported via ocean tanker to a California port and transported to a blending terminal for use in a light-duty vehicle. The values, assumptions, and equations used in this document are from the GREET 1.8b model (released December 2008), which has been modified to reflect California specific values. This model labeled “the CA-GREET model v1.8b” is available for download from the Low Carbon Fuel Standard website at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/fuels/lcfs/lcfs.htm>.

The values shown in this document are preliminary draft values and staff is in the process of evaluating them. The areas that staff may revise include emission factors, energy intensity factors, percent fuel shares, transport modes and their shares, agricultural chemical use factors, etc.

Note: At this time, analysis of land use change for sugarcane based ethanol has not been completed and results presented here do not include any potential land use change impacts. These impacts will be considered when the analysis for land use change is completed.

Figure 1 below outlines the discrete components that comprise the sugar cane ethanol pathway.

¹ <http://www.transportation.anl.gov/software/GREET/>




Figure 1. WTW Components for Sugar Cane Ethanol Produced in Brazil and Transported for Use in CA

Several general descriptions and clarification of terminology used throughout this document are:

- CA-GREET employs a recursive methodology to calculate energy consumption and emissions. To calculate WTT energy and emissions, the values being calculated are often utilized in the calculation. For example, crude oil is used as a process fuel to recover crude oil. The total crude oil recovery energy consumption includes the direct crude oil consumption AND the energy associated with crude recovery (which is the value being calculated).
- Btu/mmBtu is the energy input necessary in Btu to produce one million Btu of a finished (or intermediate) product. This description is used consistently in CA-GREET for all energy calculations.
- gCO₂e/MJ provides the total greenhouse gas emissions on a CO₂ equivalent basis per unit of energy (MJ) for a given fuel. Methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) are converted to a CO₂ equivalent basis using IPCC Global Warming Potential (GWP) values and included in the total.
- CA-GREET assumes that VOC and CO are converted to CO₂ in the atmosphere and includes these pollutants in the total CO₂ value using ratios of the appropriate molecular weights. This method is also used by the IPCC.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

- Process Efficiency for any step in CA-GREET is defined as:

$$\text{Efficiency} = \text{energy output} / (\text{energy output} + \text{energy consumed})$$

- Note that rounding of values has not been performed in several tables in this document. This is to allow stakeholders executing runs with the GREET model to compare actual output values from the CA-modified model with values in this document.

Table A below summarizes the fuel cycle energy inputs by stage (Btu/mmBtu) and Table B summarizes the major GHG emission categories and intensities (gCO₂e/MJ). The tables present energy and emission results relative to the energy content (LHV) of anhydrous ethanol (see Appendix A for greater detail about energy and emissions). Figure 2 shows the percentage energy contributions from the various components of the ethanol pathway. From an energy viewpoint, ethanol production (48.6%) and carbon in fuel (44.4%) components dominate the sugarcane ethanol pathway. Figure 3 shows the GHG contributions from the various components of this pathway. From a GHG viewpoint, sugarcane farming impacts (37.2%) and production and use of agricultural chemicals (32.7%) components are the major contributors to the sugarcane ethanol pathway. Complete details of all energy inputs and GHG emissions are provided in Appendix A. A list of all inputs is provided in Appendix B.

Note: Since all the ethanol is produced from sugar cane which consists of CO₂ fixed via photosynthesis, the tailpipe emissions from combustion of ethanol is considered to be zero. This is since the CO₂ release from combustion was actually removed from the atmosphere by the feedstock. The addition of denaturant however does lead to contributions to CO₂ during combustion which is proportional to the amount of denaturant added to anhydrous ethanol. This value is not shown below in Table B under TTW category since the values are shown for anhydrous ethanol. The discussion and calculations are presented in Appendix A under TTW section. Since the use of anhydrous ethanol as a stand alone fuel is not permitted in CA, this document does not include tailpipe emissions of CH₄ and N₂O. An accompanying document for CaRFG (containing ethanol as an oxygenate in CARBOB) provides combined effects including tailpipe emissions of using reformulated gasoline in a light-duty vehicle.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table A. Sugar Cane Ethanol Energy Use

Sugar Cane Ethanol Components	Energy* (Btu/mmBtu) (Anhydrous)	% Energy Contribution
Sugar Cane Farming	26,407	1.2%
Energy Inputs for Ag Chemicals	59,616	2.7%
Sugar Cane Transportation	25,722	1.1%
Ethanol Production	1,093,376	48.6%
Ethanol T&D	44,442	2%
Total Well-to-Tank	1,249,563	55.6%
Carbon in Fuel	1,000,000	44.4%
Total Tank-to-wheel	1,000,000	44.4%
Total Well-to-Wheel	2,249,563	100%




Figure 2. Percent Energy Contribution from WTW for Sugar Cane Ethanol

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table B. GHG Emissions Summary for Sugar Cane Ethanol

Sugar Cane Ethanol Components	GHGs (g CO₂e/MJ)	% Emission Contribution
Sugar Cane Farming (incl. straw burning)	9.9	37.2%
Ag Chemicals Production and Use Impacts	8.7	32.7%
Sugar Cane Transportation	2.0	7.5%
Ethanol Production	1.9	7.1%
Ethanol T&D	4.1	15.4%
Total Well-to-Tank	26.6	100%
Total Tank-to-wheel	0	0%
Total Well-to-Wheel	26.6	100%




Figure 3. Percent GHG Contributions from WTW for Sugar Cane Ethanol

WTT Details

This section provides a breakdown of the energy and related GHG emissions for all the various WTT components of the ethanol pathway detailed in Figure 1. Complete details including calculations, equations, etc. are provided in Appendix A.

SUGAR CANE FARMING

Table C provides a breakdown of energy input from each fuel type used in sugar cane farming activities. Table D provides information on GHG emissions related to sugar cane farming. Additional details are provided in Appendix A.

Table C. Total Energy Input by Fuel Use for Sugar Cane Farming

Fuel Type	Total Energy (Btu/mmBtu)
Diesel fuel	10,247
Gasoline	3,401
Natural gas	5,213
Liquefied petroleum gas	4,790
Electricity	2,756
Total Energy for Sugar Cane Farming	26,407

See table 1.03

Table D. GHG Emissions from Sugar Cane Farming and Straw Burning

Emission Species	Farming	Straw Burning
CH ₄	< 0.01	6.6
N ₂ O	0.01	2.1
VOC	< 0.01	2.2
CO	< 0.01	14.4
CO ₂	1.69	163.20
Biogenic CO ₂ credit	n/a	(-180.31)
Total (gCO₂e/MJ)	1.74	8.2
Total GHG (gCO₂e/MJ)		9.9

See table 1.12

CHEMICAL INPUTS FOR AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS

Table E provides details the energy inputs required to produce chemicals used in agricultural operations related to sugar cane farming. This includes fertilizers such as nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium (potash), and calcium carbonate (lime) as well as herbicides and insecticides. Table F provides details of the associated GHG emissions related to the production of these chemicals as well as their use in sugar cane farming. N₂O and CO₂ emissions from the soil are based on the amount of fertilizer and lime applied respectively. Complete details are provided in Appendix A.

Table E. Energy Inputs for Agricultural Chemicals for Sugar Cane Farming

Chemical Type	Energy Use, (Btu/mmBtu)
Nitrogen Fertilizer	31,054
Phosphate Fertilizer	880
Potash	885
Lime	22,354
Herbicide	3,853
Insecticide	375
Total	59,616

See table 2.01

Table F. Total GHG Emissions from Agricultural Chemical Use

Ethanol Pathway	Agricultural Chemicals			Soil N₂O and NO	CO₂ from Application of Lime	Total
	Fertilizers	Herbicide	Pesticide			
GHGs (gCO₂e/MJ)	3.7	0.3	0.03	3.5	1.2	8.7

See tables 2.03, 2.05, 2.06 and 2.07

SUGAR CANE TRANSPORT

Table G details the energy inputs required to transport sugar cane from the farm to the ethanol production plant using heavy duty trucks. Table H provides details of the associated GHG emissions related to transportation of sugar cane from the farm to the ethanol plant. Complete details are provided in Appendix A.

Table G. Sugar Cane Transport Energy

Transport Mode	Energy Consumption (Btu/mmBtu)
Total Energy for Sugarcane Transport	25,722

See table 3.02

Table H. Sugar Cane Transport – Total GHG Emissions

Transport Mode	GHG Emissions (gCO ₂ e/MJ)
VOC	< 0.01
CH ₄	< 0.01
N ₂ O	< 0.01
CO	< 0.01
CO ₂	2.0
Total GHGs	2.0

See table 3.04

ETHANOL PRODUCTION

Table I details the energy inputs required to produce ethanol from sugar cane. Table J provides details of the associated GHG emissions related to production of ethanol. Credit from bagasse is also shown in this table. Complete details are provided in Appendix A.

Table I. Ethanol Production Energy Use

Fuel Type	Total Energy
From Residual Oil (Btu/gal)	284
From Bagasse (Btu/gal)	83,132
Total Energy Input for Ethanol Production (Btu/gal)	83,415
Total Energy Input for Ethanol Production (Btu/mmBtu)	1,093,743

See table 4.02

Table J. GHG Emissions for Ethanol Production

GHG Species	(gCO₂e/MJ)
CO ₂ from Residual Oil	0.03
CO ₂ from Bagasse Burning	124.9
CO ₂ credit for Bagasse	-122.97
CH ₄	< 0.01
N ₂ O	< 0.01
VOC from Residual Oil	< 0.01
VOC from Bagasse Burning	0.02
VOC from non-combustion source	0.09
CO from Residual Oil	< 0.01
CO from Bagasse Burning	0.12
Total GHGs	1.9

See table 4.04

ETHANOL TRANSPORT AND DISTRIBUTION

Ethanol is transported within Brazil by rail or pipeline. It is then shipped to the US by ocean tanker. Several different denaturant blending options can apply to Brazilian ethanol. A significant fraction of ethanol imported to the U.S. is processed as hydrated ethanol (5% water) in the Caribbean where denaturant is also added. This delivery mode is not modeled in CA-GREET so the pathway based on delivering anhydrous ethanol to California is shown here. Once in CA, it is blended with CAROB and transported and distributed by heavy duty trucks. Table K details the energy inputs required to transport ethanol. Table L provides details of the associated GHG emissions related to ethanol transport and distribution. Additional details are provided in Appendix A.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table K. Energy Use for Ethanol Transport and Distribution (T&D)

Transport Mode	Btu/mmBtu
Transportation within Brazil and to US Port	
By Ocean Tanker	21,510
By Rail	4,614
By Pipeline	3,056
Transportation within U.S	
By Heavy Duty Truck	10,251
Distribution within US	
By Heavy Duty Truck	2,460
Total Ethanol T&D	44,442

See table 5.02

Table L. GHG Emissions Related to Ethanol Transport

Transport Mode	g/MJ
Transportation within Brazil and to US Port	
By Ocean Tanker	1.81
By Rail	0.72
By Pipeline	0.45
Transportation within U.S	
By Heavy Duty Truck	0.81
Distribution within US	
By Heavy Duty Truck	0.32
T&D Total (Btu/mmBtu Ethanol)	4.1

See table 5.04

Since the CO₂ released from ethanol combustion is the carbon fixed during crop growth, the CO₂ emissions are not counted in the Life Cycle Analysis of sugarcane ethanol. Also, since ethanol is not used as a fuel but as an oxygenate in CaRFG, tailpipe emissions from use of anhydrous ethanol is not discussed in this document. Staff has provided a CaRFG (California Reformulated Gasoline) document which details the blending of ethanol into CARBOB for use as CaRFG and emissions from use of CaRFG.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

(This page intentionally left blank.)

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

APPENDIX A

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

(This page intentionally left blank.)

SECTION 1. SUGAR CANE FARMING

1.1 Energy Use for Sugar Cane Farming

This section presents the direct farming energy inputs for sugar cane farming. For farming, the CA-GREET model calculates energy and emissions based on the quantity of fuel (Btu) and chemicals used per bushel of sugar cane, rather than using energy efficiencies, as the petroleum pathways do in CA-GREET. The total input energy per tonne of sugar cane is 41,592 Btu (CA-GREET default) using a mix of fuel types shown in Table 1.01.

The Brazilian sugar cane ethanol pathway uses three different electricity mixes: Brazilian average, Brazilian marginal and U.S. average mix. The electricity mix used for sugar cane farming is the Brazilian average mix, and U.S. electricity is the assumed input for fertilizer production (see Sections 2.1 and 2.2). Marginal Brazilian electricity (natural gas) is the assumed electricity mix displaced by bagasse-fired exported electricity produced at the ethanol plant. Table 1.02 below shows generation shares of the three electricity mixes used in this fuel pathway.

Table 1.01. Primary Energy Inputs by Fuel/Energy Input Type for Farm Operations

Fuel Type	Fuel Share	Formula	Primary Energy Input (Btu/tonne)	Primary Energy Input (Btu/mmBtu)
Diesel Fuel	38.3%	41,592*38.3%	15,930	9,858
Gasoline	12.3%	41,592*12.3%	5,116	3,166
Natural Gas	21.5%	41,592*21.5%	8,942	5,534
Liquefied Petroleum Gas	18.8%	41,592*18.8%	7,819	4,839
Electricity	9%	41,592*9%	3,743	2,316
Direct Energy Consumption for Sugar Cane Cultivation (unadjusted)			41,550	22,681

To convert Btu/tonne into the standard units of Btu/mmBtu, we use the following convention for anhydrous ethanol:

$41,550 \text{ (Btu/tonne)} / (24 \text{ (gallons/tonne)} * 76,330 \text{ Btu/gal}) * 10^6$ where :
 41,550 is a calculated value in Table 1.01
 24 (gallons/tonne) = sugar cane EtOH yield (CA-GREET default)
 76,330 Btu/gal = Low Heating Value of anhydrous ethanol (CA-GREET default)

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 1.02. General Shares of Electricity Mix

Fuel	Brazilian Average Mix	U.S. Average Mix	Brazilian Marginal Mix
Petroleum	1.2%	2.7%	0.0%
NG	5.0%	18.9%	100.0%
Coal	1.7%	50.7%	0.0%
Biomass	4.2%	1.3%	0.0%
Nuclear	3.0%	18.7%	0.0%
Hydro	82.9%	(Included in "Others")	0.0%
Others	2.0%	7.7%	0.0%

The primary energy inputs do not consider the upstream energy associated with the fuels. For example, the amount of energy associated with diesel does not include the energy and emissions associated with the making of the diesel. CA-GREET accounts for the 'upstream' energy associated with fuels by multiplying with appropriate factors. Calculations are shown in Table 1.03. The factors A, B, etc. used in table 1.03 are defined in Table 1.04. Table 1.05 provides additional details for values used in Table 1.04.

Table 1.03. Calculating Total Energy Input by Fuel for Sugar Cane Cultivation

Fuel Type	Formula	Total Energy (Btu/tonne)	Total Energy (Btu/mmBtu)
Diesel fuel	$A*[1+((B*C)+D/10^6)]$	18803	10247.
Gasoline	$E*[1+((B*F)+G/10^6)]$	6240.4	3400.8
Natural gas	$H*(1+I)/10^6$	9565.2	5212.7
LPG	$(J)*(K)*(1+(L*M)/10^6) + (J)*(N)*(1+(P*O+Q)/10^6)$	8789.3	4789.9
Electricity	$R*S/10^6$	5057.8	2756.3
Total Energy for Sugar Cane Cultivation		48,456	26,407

Note: Brazilian average electricity mix used. No energy inputs are included for agricultural machinery.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW*Table 1.04. Values Used in Table 1.03*

Factor	Description	Value	Reference
A	Direct Diesel Input	15,930 Btu/tonne	calculated in Table 1.01
B	Crude Energy	31,657 Btu/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculated
C	Diesel Loss Factor	1.00004	CA-GREET default value
D	Diesel Energy	125,303 Btu/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculated
E	Direct Gasoline Input	5,116 Btu/tonne	calculated in Table 1.01
F	Gasoline Loss Factor	1.00081	CA-GREET default
G	Gasoline Energy	169,676 Btu/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculated
H	Direct NG Input	8,942 Btu/tonne	calculated in Table 1.01
I	NG Stationary Energy	72,626 Btu/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculated
J	Direct LPG Input	7,819 Btu/tonne	calculated in Table 1.01
K	NG for LPG Production Share	60%	CA-GREET default
L	NG to LPG Loss Factor	1.00006	CA-GREET default
M	NG to LPG Fuel Stage Energy	48,835 Btu/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculated
N	Petroleum for LPG Production Share	40%	CA-GREET default
O	Petroleum to LPG Loss Factor	1.00012	CA-GREET calculated
P	Petroleum to LPG Fuel Crude Energy	31,657 Btu/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculated
Q	Petroleum to LPG Fuel Energy	75,622 Btu/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculated
R	Direct Electricity Input	3,743 Btu/tonne	calculated in Table 1.01
S	Stationary Electricity Feedstock Production	1,347,391 Btu/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculated

The factors listed in Table 1.04 are derived from the energy contributions of all other fuels that were used in processing these fuels. Those fuels are shown in Table 1.05 below, in two components: WTT energy (E) and Specific Energy (S) for each fuel type.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 1.05. Energy Consumption in the WTT Process and Specific Energy

	WTT energy (Btu input/mmBtu product)	S: Specific Energy (Btu input/Btu product)
Crude Recovery	$WTT_{Crude\ Recovery} = 44,499$ (CA-GREET calculated)	$S_{Crude\ Recovery} = 1 + WTT_{Crude\ Recovery} / 10^6 = 1.028$
B	$WTT_{Crude} = WTT_{Crude\ Recovery} * LF_{T\&D} + WTT_{Crude\ T\&D} + WTT_{Crude\ Storage} = 28,249 * 1.00006 + 3,406 = 31,657$	$LF_{T\&D}$ = Loss Factor for Transport and Distribution = 1.00006 (CA-GREET default) $WTT_{Crude\ T\&D} = 3,406$ (CA-GREET calculated) $WTT_{Crude\ Storage} = 0.0$ (CA-GREET default)
Residual Oil	$WTT_{Res\ Oil} = 55,561$ (CA-GREET calculated)	$S_{Res\ Oil} = 1 + (WTT_{Crude} * LF_{Crude} + WTT_{Res\ Oil}) / 10^6 = 1.106$ $LF_{Crude} = 1.00000$ (CA-GREET default)
D	$WTT_{diesel} = 124,812$ (CA-GREET calculated)	$S_{diesel} = 1 + (WTT_{Crude} * LF_{diesel} + WTT_{diesel}) / 10^6 = 1.157$. $LF_{diesel} = 1.00004$ (CA-GREET default).
G	$WTT_{gasoline} = 164,227$ (CA-GREET calculated)	$S_{gasoline} = 1 + (WTT_{Crude} * Loss\ Factor_{gasoline} + WTT_{gasoline}) / 10^6 = 1.201$ $LF_{gasoline} = 1.00081$ (CA-GREET default)
I	$WTT_{NG} = (WTT_{NG\ Recovery} * LF_{processing} + WTT_{NG\ Process}) * LF_{T\&D} + WTT_{T\&D} = 69,664$ (CA-GREET calculated)	$S_{NG} = 1 + WTT_{NG} / 10^6 = 1.073$ Natural Gas recovery, Process and T&D includes $WTT_{NG\ Recovery} = 31,125$, $WTT_{NG\ Process} = 31,843$, $LF_{Processing} = 1.00148$ and $WTT_{NG\ T\&D} = 9,381$. $LF_{T\&D} = 1.00367$ (all CA-GREET calculated)
S	$WTT_{electricity} = 1,347,391$	$S_{Electricity} = (WTT_{feedstock} + WTT_{fuel}) / 10^6 = 2.347$

Note: $WTT_{Crude\ Recovery}$: WTT energy for crude oil recovery, of self use of crude oil at the well, not include T&D. $WTT_{Crude\ Storage}$: WTT energy of crude storage

1.2 GHG Emissions from Sugar Cane Farming

CA-GREET calculates carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions for each component of the pathway and uses IPCC Global Warming Potentials (GWP) to calculate CO₂ equivalent values for CH₄ and N₂O (see Table 1.06). For VOC and CO, CA-GREET uses a carbon ratio to calculate CO₂ equivalent values which are detailed in a note below Table 1.06. These are based on the oxidation of CO and VOC to CO₂ in the atmosphere. Note that CA-GREET v1.8b has updated GWPs for CH₄ and N₂O compared to CA-GREET v1.7b. The earlier GWPs of 23 and 296 for CH₄ and N₂O have been changed to 25 and 298 respectively in the current version of CA-GREET. This is to reflect updated IPCC values for these GHG species.

Table 1.06. Global Warming Potentials for Gases

GHG Species	GWP (relative to CO₂)
CO ₂	1
CH ₄	25
N ₂ O	298
VOC	3.1
CO	1.6

Carbon ratio of VOC = 0.85 grams CO₂/MJ ; grams VOC*(0.85)*(44/12) = 3.1

Carbon ratio of CO = 0.43 grams CO₂/MJ ; grams CO/mmBtu*(0.43)*(44/12) = 1.6

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

The GHG emissions for farm energy use are determined separately for CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O in CA-GREET using the direct energy inputs presented in Section 1.1 (Btu/tonne) and the combustion and upstream emissions for the energy inputs. CA-GREET calculates the emissions for each fossil fuel input by multiplying fuel input (Btu/tonne) by the total emissions from combustion, crude production and fuel production. The electricity emissions are calculated by multiplying the electricity input (Btu/tonne) by the total (feedstock plus fuel) emissions associated with the chosen electricity mix (from the *Electricity* Tab in CA-GREET). Note that U. S. average emission factors are used for Brazilian fuel use and electricity generation. Table 1.07 below shows equations and calculated values by fuel type for sugar cane farming CO₂ emissions. Equations and values for CH₄ and N₂O are not shown, but use the same structure. Table 1.08 provides values for parameters used in equations shown in Table 1.07.

Table 1.07. CA-GREET Calculations for CO₂ Emissions from Sugar Cane Farming

Fuel	Formula	CO₂ Emissions (g/tonne)	CO₂ Emissions (g/mmBtu)
Diesel	$[(A)*[(B)*(C) + (D)*(E)+(F)*(G)+(H)*(I)+(J)*(K)+(L)]]/10^6$	1,435	782
Gasoline	$[(M)*[(N)+ (J)*(O)+(P)]]/10^6$	466	254
Natural Gas	$[(Q)*[(R)*(S) + (T)*(U)+(V)*(W)+(X)*(Y)+(Z)]]/10^6$	552	301
LPG	$[(AA)*[(BB)+((J)*(CC)+(DD)+(EE)*(FF)+(GG))/2]]/10^6$	599	326
Electricity	$[(HH)*(II)]/10^6$	69	38
Total CO₂ Emissions		3,120	1,701

To convert from g/tonne to g/mmBtu use:

$$3,120 \text{ (g/tonne)} / (24 \text{ (gallons/tonne)} * 76,330 \text{ Btu/gal}) * 10^6$$

where :

24 (gallons/tonne) = sugar cane EtOH yield (CA-GREET default)

76,330 Btu/gal = Low Heating Value of anhydrous ethanol (CA-GREET default)

10⁶ is to convert to mmBtu

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 1.08. Input Values for Calculations in Table 1.06

Variable	Relevant Parameters*	Reference
A	= Diesel input = 15,930 Btu/tonne	Table 1.01
B	= % Fuel share diesel boiler = 0%	CA-GREET default
C	= Boiler CO ₂ emissions = 78,167 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
D	= % Fuel share diesel stationary engine = 0%	CA-GREET default
E	= IC Engine CO ₂ Emissions = 77,401 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
F	= % Fuel share diesel turbine = 0%	CA-GREET default
G	= Turbine CO ₂ emissions 78,179 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
H	= % Fuel share diesel tractor = 100%	CA-GREET default
I	= Tractor CO ₂ emissions = 77,411 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
J	= Crude production CO ₂ emissions = 3,260 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculation
K	= Diesel loss factor = 1.00004	CA-GREET default
L	= Diesel production CO ₂ emissions = 9,387 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
M	= Gasoline input = 5,116 Btu/tonne	Table 1.01
N	= Farming tractor CO ₂ emission factor = 75,645 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
O	= Gasoline loss factor = 1.00081	CA-GREET default
P	= Gasoline production CO ₂ emissions = 12,122 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculation
Q	= NG input = 8,942 Btu/tonne	Table 1.01
R	= % Fuel share NG engine = 100%	CA-GREET default
S	= Engine CO ₂ emission factor = 56,551 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
T	= % Fuel share NG large turbine = 0%	CA-GREET default
U	= Turbine CO ₂ emission factor = 58,179 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
V	= % Fuel share NG large boiler = 0%	CA-GREET default
W	= Large boiler CO ₂ emission factor = 58,198 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
X	= % Fuel share small NG boiler = 0%	CA-GREET default
Y	= Small boiler CO ₂ emission factor = 58,176 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
Z	= WTT stationary NG CO ₂ emissions = 5,218 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculation
AA	= LPG input = 7,819 Btu/tonne	Table 1.01
BB	= Commercial boiler CO ₂ emission factor = 68,036 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET default
CC	= LPG loss factor = 1.00012	CA-GREET default
DD	= LPG production CO ₂ emissions = 5,708 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculation
EE	= LNG feedstock CO ₂ emissions = 4,882 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculation
FF	= NG to LPG loss factor = 1.00006	CA-GREET default
GG	= NG to LPG fuel CO ₂ emissions = 3,162 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculation
HH	= Electricity input = 3,743 Btu/tonne	Table 1.01
II	= Electricity CO ₂ emissions = 18,504 g/mmBtu	CA-GREET calculation

Note: The calculations for CH₄ and N₂O are analogous.

*Relevant parameters here are calculated values in GREET, except for technology shares, which are direct inputs.

Other GHGs, including VOC, CO, CH₄, and N₂O emissions are calculated with the same equations, energy input, and loss factors as CO₂ emissions calculations shown in Tables 1.07 and 1.08, but with different VOC, CO, CH₄, and N₂O emission factors. Table 1.09 shows the results of the calculations of VOC, CO, CH₄, and N₂O in (g/tonne) then converted to g/mmBtu. The conversion is performed as shown in the note below Table 1.07.

Table 1.09. GHG Emissions from Sugar Cane Farming

Emission Species	Emissions¹ (g/tonne)	GHGs (gCO₂e/mmBtu)	GHGs (gCO₂e/MJ)
CH ₄	7.82	106.5	0.1
N ₂ O	0.08	11.9	0.01
CO ₂	3,035	1,654	1.57
Total GHG		1,772	1.7

¹Emissions in grams of gaseous species per tonne. To convert all VOC, CO, CH₄ and N₂O (g/tonne) to (g/mmBtu) = (g/tonne)/(Ethanol Yield (gal/tonne) * LHV of Anhydrous Ethanol (Btu/gal))*10⁶. Note that for non-CO₂ gases when expressed as GHG in gCO₂e/mmBtu, the appropriate conversion using GWPs has been performed.

1.3 GHG Emissions from Straw Burning in Field

The sugar cane field is burned prior to harvesting by hand. The fire removes dry leaves and straw and kills any pests present while leaving the wet, sugar-rich stalks undamaged. The CA-GREET model uses the input assumptions shown below in Table 1.10 and emission factors presented in Table 1.11 to calculate emissions from field burning. An emission credit is also calculated in grams of CO₂/tonne cane, assuming that all carbon in burned residue is converted to CO₂.

Table 1.10 Inputs for Calculating Field Burning Emissions

Sugar Cane Straw Burning Input Parameters	Straw Yield (Dry tonne straw/tonne cane)	Straw C Ratio (% by weight)
	0.190	50.0%

Table 1.11 Sugar Cane Straw Burning Emission Factors

Emission Species	CO₂ EF	VOC EF	CO EF	CH₄ EF	N₂O EF
Emission Factor (g/kg straw burned)	1,660	7.0	92.0	2.7	0.07

The straw burning emissions for CO₂ are calculated as follows:

$$(1,660 \text{ g/kg straw})(0.190 \text{ dry tonne straw/tonne cane})(1,000 \text{ kg/tonne}) = 315,973$$

The CO₂ emission credit is calculated as follows:

$$-(0.190 \text{ dry tonne straw/tonne cane}) * (50.0\% \text{ C content by wt.}) * (1,000 \text{ kg/tonne}) * (1,000 \text{ g/Kg}) * (44/12) = -349,067$$

Table 1.12 shows all emission species calculated the same way as CO₂ example above.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 1.12 Sugar Cane Straw Burning Emissions

Emission Species	Emissions (g/tonne Cane)	GHG (gCO₂e/mmBtu EtOH)	GHG (gCO₂e/MJ EtOH)
VOC	1,332.80	2,287	2.2
CO	17,516.80	15,204	14.4
CH ₄	514.1	7,003.90	6.6
N ₂ O	13.3	2,164.50	2.1
CO ₂	315,973	172,195	163.2
Biogenic CO ₂ Credit	-349,067	-190,230	-180.3
Total GHG		23,226	
GHG (gCO₂e/MJ)			8.2

The same notes under Table 1.09 apply for this table.

Total GHG emissions from sugarcane farming and straw burning is therefore **1.74 + 8.2 = 9.9 gCO₂/MJ**.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

(This page was intentionally left blank.)

SECTION 2. CHEMICAL INPUTS FOR AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS

2.1 Energy Calculations for Production of Chemical Inputs

Chemical inputs, including fertilizer, herbicide and insecticide, are input on a g-nutrient/tonne (fertilizer) or g-product/tonne (herbicide and pesticide) basis. Table 2.01 below presents the CA-GREET chemical inputs per bushel of sugar cane, the total energy required to produce the chemical product and the calculated upstream energy required to produce a bushel of sugar cane using these inputs. Both chemical input values and product energy values are CA-GREET defaults.

Table 2.01. Sugar Cane Farming Chemical Inputs

Chemical Type	Chemical Input (Btu/g)	Product Input Factors (g/tonne)	WTT Energy (Btu/tonne)	WTT Energy (Btu/mmBtu)
Nitrogen Fertilizer	45.9	1,091.7	50,133	31,054
Phosphate Fertilizer	13.3	120.8	1,604	880
Potash	8.4	193.6	1,624	892
Lime	7.7	5,337.7	41,019	22,512
Herbicide (average)	262.8	26.9	7,070	3,898
Insecticide (average)	311.3	2.21	688	379
Total				59,616

Note: Ethanol yields for sugar cane ethanol are assumed to be 24 gal/tonne in CA-GREET. The WTT energy = chemical input (g/tonne)* product input energy (Btu/g).

Example Calculation:

For Nitrogen Fertilizer: WTT Energy (Btu/tonne) = 45.9 (Btu/g) * 1,092 (g/tonne) = 50,133 Btu/tonne

To convert Btu/tonne into the standard units of Btu/mmBtu, we use the following:

$(50,133 \text{ Btu/tonne}) / ((24 \text{ gallons/tonne}) * 76,330 \text{ Btu/gal}) * 10^6$ where :

50,133 is a calculated value in Table 2.01

24 gallons/tonne = sugar cane EtOH yield (CA-GREET default)

76,330 Btu/gal = Lower Heating Value of anhydrous ethanol (CA-GREET default)

CA-GREET models nitrogen fertilizer as a weighted average of ammonia (70.7%), urea (21.1%) and ammonium nitrate (8.2%) fertilizer. As Table 2.01 shows, nitrogen fertilizer input accounts for more than half of total chemical energy input. The herbicide production energy is a weighted average of four types of herbicides used: atrazine (31.2%), metolachlor (28.1%), acetochlor (23.6%) and cyanazine (17.1%). The insecticide inputs represent an “average” insecticide, rather than an explicitly weighted average of specific insecticides. The energy required to produce nitrogen fertilizers, herbicides or pesticides does not vary significantly by category, attesting to the validity of using average energy inputs.

2.2 GHG Calculation from Production and Use of Agricultural Chemicals

This component includes all of the upstream emissions related to the manufacturing of agricultural chemical products. It also includes impacts from the use of agricultural chemicals in farming. Upstream emissions are calculated in CA-GREET per tonne of product, including the production, process and transportation emissions associated with manufacturing chemicals; these intermediate calculations take place in the Ag Inputs sheet. These values are converted to emissions per tonne of nutrient using the ratio of nutrient to product.

Nitrogen fertilizer greenhouse emissions are modeled as a weighted average of 3 types of N-fertilizers modeled in CA-GREET. Energy and emissions are converted to Btu or grams greenhouse gases per g of nutrient (fertilizer) or product (herbicide and pesticide). Average herbicide emissions are calculated using a weighted average of 4 herbicides and pesticide emissions are based on a single pesticide type. Table 2.02 below shows the greenhouse emissions for agricultural chemicals in grams per gram of nutrient for fertilizers and per gram of product for herbicides and pesticides. The equations are complex and not shown here since agricultural inputs apply to large variety of crop cultivation and are not specific to sugar cane cultivation.

Table 2.02. Calculated GHG Emissions (g/g) Associated with Production of Agricultural Chemicals

GHG Type	Nitrogen (weighted average)	P₂O₅	K₂O	CaCO₃	Herbicide (weighted average)	Pesticide
CH ₄	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.03	0.03
N ₂ O	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
CO ₂	2.39	0.98	0.66	0.60	20.53	23.87
Convert to GHG (g/g)	2.9	1.0	0.7	0.6	21.3	24.84

The greenhouse emissions of agricultural inputs are multiplied by chemical input factors (g/tonne) in the *Ethanol* sheet and a loss factor from the “*Ag_Inputs*” sheet to yield fertilizer emissions in grams per bushel of sugar cane produced. Table 2.03 below shows the calculations for CO₂ emissions associated with the use of chemical inputs in g/tonne of sugar cane produced. Table 2.04 details the values used in calculations in Table 2.03. The equations for CH₄ and N₂O are analogous to these calculations and are not shown. Table 2.05 shows the emission results for all greenhouse gases for chemical use, based on the calculations shown in Table 2.03.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 2.03. Calculated CO₂ Emissions Associated with Production of Agricultural Chemicals

Chemical Product	Formula	CO ₂ Emissions		
		(g/tonne)	(g/mmBtu)	(gCO ₂ /MJ)
Nitrogen (weighted average)	(A)*(B)*(C)	2,971	1,619	
P ₂ O ₅	(D)*(E)*(F)	118	64	
K ₂ O	(G)*(H)*(I)	127	69	
CaCO ₃	(J)*(K)*(L)	3,210	1,749	
Herbicide	(M)*(N)*(O)	552	301	
Pesticide	(P)*(Q)*(R)	53	29	
Total CO ₂ emissions		7,031	3,832	3.63

Table 2.04. Calculated GHG Emissions (g/g) Associated with Production of Agricultural Chemicals

Variable	Relevant Parameters	Reference
A	= Nitrogen input = 1,091.7 g/tonne	CA-GREET default
B	= Nitrogen chemical cycle emissions = 2.39 g/g	Table 2.02
C	= Nitrogen loss factor = 1.0	CA-GREET default
D	= P ₂ O ₅ input = 120.8 g/tonne	CA-GREET default
E	= P ₂ O ₅ chemical cycle emissions = 0.98 g/g	Table 2.02
F	= P ₂ O ₅ loss factor = 1.0	CA-GREET default
G	= K ₂ O input = 193.6 g/tonne	CA-GREET default
H	= K ₂ O chemical cycle emissions = 0.66 g/g	Table 2.02
I	= K ₂ O loss factor = 1.0	CA-GREET default
J	= CaCO ₃ input = 5,337.7 g/tonne	CA-GREET default
K	= CaCO ₃ chemical cycle emissions = 0.60 g/g	Table 2.02
L	= CaCO ₃ loss factor = 1.0	CA-GREET default
M	= Herbicide input = 26.9 g/tonne	CA-GREET default
N	= Herbicide chemical cycle emissions = 20.53 g/g	Table 2.02
O	= Herbicide loss factor = 1.0	CA-GREET default
P	= Pesticide input = 2.21 g/tonne	CA-GREET default
Q	= Pesticide chemical cycle emissions = 23.87 g/g	Table 2.02
R	= Pesticide loss factor = 1.0	CA-GREET default

Note: Loss Factor occurs during transportation due to evaporation, venting, etc.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 2.05 shows the emission results (g/tonne) for all GHG emissions for production of chemicals used in agriculture based on the calculations shown in Table 2.03. The CH₄ and N₂O emissions results shown in Table 2.05 are calculated with the same equations as CO₂ emission calculations, except that CO₂ emission factors are replaced by CH₄ and N₂O emission factors. Table 2.05 also shows the WTT emissions on an energy basis. Note that converting from g/tonne to g/mmBtu is shown in a note below Table 2.05. To convert from g/mmBtu to gCO₂e/mmBtu, non-CO₂ gasses are adjusted using their respective GWPs. For CO and VOC, see note below Table 1.08.

Table 2.05. Calculated GHG Emissions from Production of Agricultural Chemicals

GHG Type	Nitrogen (weighted average)	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	CaCO ₃	Total Fertilizer	Herbicide (weighted average)	Pesticide	Total
CH ₄ (g/tonne)	3.1	0.2	0.2	4.9		0.8	0.1	9.3
N ₂ O (g/tonne)	1.8	<0.01	<0.01	0.05		<0.01	<0.01	1.8
CO ₂ (g/tonne)	2,971	118	127	3,210		552	53	6,743.4
GHGs (g/tonne)	3,579	124	133	3,344		574	55	7524.2
GHGs (g/mmBtu)	1,951	68	72	1,822	3,913	313	30	4,256
GHGs (g/MJ)	1.85	0.06	0.07	1.73	3.70	0.30	0.03	4

Note: To convert (g/tonne) to (g/mmBtu) = (g/tonne)/(Ethanol Yield (gal/tonne) * LHV of Anhydrous Ethanol (Btu/gal))*10⁶. LHV of denatured ethanol is 76,330 Btu/gal and ethanol yield is assumed to be 24 gal/tonne.

Impact of soil N₂O emissions resulting from nitrogen fertilizer use on WTT GHG emissions

CA-GREET also calculates direct field and downstream N₂O emissions resulting from nitrogen fertilizer input. Table 2.06 below shows the two main inputs: fertilizer input (g/tonne) and percent conversion of N-input to N₂O. The Table shows the N₂O emissions on an energy basis. CA-GREET v1.8b assumes 2.0% of fertilizer-N is ultimately converted to N₂O. The calculation also uses the mass ratio of N₂O to N₂ (44/28). N₂ is used rather than N because two fixed N atoms are required for every N₂O molecule formed. Table 2.06 provides total GHG impacts from soil N₂O emissions.

Table 2.06. Inputs and Calculated Emissions for Soil NO and N₂O from Sugar Cane Farming

	Fertilizer N input (g/tonne)	Percent conversion to N ₂ O-N	N ₂ O formed/ N ₂ O-N (g/g)	N Converted (g/tonne)	N ₂ O or NO Emissions (g/tonne)	GHG Emissions (g/mmBtu)	GHG Emissions (gCO ₂ e/MJ)
N ₂ O	1,091.7	1.3%	44/28	14.5	22.7	3,691	3.5
						Total	3.5

Note: Soil N₂O emissions = (1,091.8 g N/tonne)(1.3%)(44 g N₂O/28 g N₂) = 22.7 g N₂O/tonne
N₂O Emissions: N in N₂O as % of N in N fertilizer and biomass: CA-GREET default of 1.3%

Effect of Lime added to soil on GHG emissions

CA-GREET assumes that all of the carbon in added lime is emitted as CO₂. This results in the following CO₂ emission: Soil CO₂ emissions = (5,337.7 g CaCO₃/tonne)*(44 g CO₂/100 g CaCO₃) = 2,349 g CO₂/tonne = 1,282 g CO₂/mmBtu = 1.2 g CO₂/MJ.

Tables 2.05, 2.06 and emissions from adding lime to soil are combined to provide the total GHG emissions and are detailed in Table 2.07.

Table 2.07. Total GHG Emissions from Agricultural Chemical Use for Sugar Cane Ethanol

Ethanol Pathway	Fertilizers	Herbicide	Pesticide	Soil N₂O and NO	CO₂ from CaCO₃	Total (gCO_{2e}/MJ)
GHGs (gCO_{2e}/MJ)	3.7	0.3	0.03	3.5	1.2	8.7

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

(This page intentionally left blank.)

SECTION 3. SUGAR CANE TRANSPORT

3.1 Energy for Sugar Cane Transportation

CA-GREET calculates the total energy needed (Btu/tonne) to transport sugar cane from the field to the ethanol production facility using heavy duty trucks. Table 3.01 below shows the sugar cane transportation distance and energy inputs. The calculations are based on heavy duty truck capacities of 17 tonnes. The default transport distance is 12 miles. CA-GREET calculates the diesel energy per tonne mile based cargo capacity of the truck and its fuel economy and assumes that truck trips carrying sugar cane and returning empty use the same energy. All values are CA-GREET default values.

Table 3.01. Sugar cane Transport Inputs

Transport Mode	Energy Intensity (Btu/tonne-mile)	Distance from Origin to Destination (mi)	Capacity (tonnes)	Fuel Consumption (mi/gal)	Energy Consumption of Truck (Btu/mi)	Shares of Diesel Used
Field to Ethanol Plant	1,511	12	17	5	25,690	100%

The calculated sugar cane transport energy on a Btu per tonne of sugar cane basis is shown below in Table 3.02 using the values in Table 3.01.

Table 3.02. Sugar Cane Transport Energy

Transport Mode	Energy Consumption (Btu/ton)
Field to Ethanol Plant	(12 miles one-way distance)*(1,511 Btu/ton-mile origin to destination + 1,511 Btu/ton-mile back-haul)*(Diesel share 100%)*(1+Diesel WTT Energy 0.157 Btu/Btu) /0.907 (tonnes/ton)= 47,200 Btu/ton
Total	47,200 (Btu/ton)
Total (anhydrous ethanol)	25,722 (Btu/mmBtu)

Note: To convert (Btu/ton) to (Btu/mmBtu) = (Btu/ton)/(0.907 tonnes/ton)/(Ethanol Yield (gal/tonne) * LHV of Anhydrous Ethanol (Btu/gal))*10⁶. Diesel WTT energy is a CA-GREET calculation

3.2 GHG Calculations from Sugar Cane Transportation

GHG from sugar cane transportation are calculated from section 3.1 above with the same transportation mode, miles traveled, etc. as indicated by Table 3.01 above. Tables 3.03 below detail key assumptions of calculating GHG from sugar cane transportation. All values used in calculations are CA-GREET default values.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 3.03. Key Assumptions in Calculating GHG Emissions from Sugar Cane

Transport Mode	Energy Intensity (Btu/tonne-mile)	Distance from Origin to Destination (mi)	CO ₂ Emission Factors of Truck (g/mi)	WTT Transport Diesel Emissions (g/mmBtu)	CO ₂ Emission Factors of Diesel Combustion (g/mmBtu)
Sugar cane to plant by heavy duty truck	1,511	12	1999 (2,002)*	12,647	77809 (77,913)*

Note: *values in parenthesis are for the return trips.

Sugarcane transport emissions is first calculated on a g/ton basis and then finally converted to g/mmBtu and is shown in Table 3.04 below.

Table 3.04. Sugar Cane Transport - CO₂ Emissions in g/mmBtu

Transport Mode	CO ₂ Emission (g/tonne)	CO ₂ Emission (g/mmBtu)
Sugar Cane to Ethanol Plant by Heavy Duty Truck	3,701	2,017
Total (gCO₂/MJ anhydrous)		2.0

Note: Example formula to calculate CO₂ emission of Heavy Duty Truck above:

$$[(77,809 \text{ g/mmBtu}) + (12,647 \text{ g/mmBtu}) * (100\% \text{ diesel used})] * 1,511 \text{ (Btu/ton-mile)} + [(77,913 \text{ g/mmBtu}) + (12,647 \text{ g/mmBtu}) * (100\% \text{ diesel used})] * 1,511 \text{ Btu/ton-mile}] * 12 \text{ miles} / 0.907 \text{ ton/tonne} / (10^6 \text{ mmBtu/Btu}) = 3,710 \text{ g/tonne}.$$

To convert (g/tonne) to (g/mmBtu) = (g/tonne) / (Ethanol Yield (gal/tonne) * LHV of Anhydrous Ethanol (Btu/gal)) * 10^6 .

Similarly, CH₄, N₂O, VOC, and CO are calculated the same way (with different emission factors for each species) and shown in Table 3.05. Then all emissions are converted to CO₂ equivalent are also shown. The emissions are shown on an anhydrous ethanol basis.

Table 3.05. Sugar Cane Transport – Other GHG Emissions

Emissions Units	CH ₄	N ₂ O	VOC	CO	CO ₂	GHG (gCO _{2e} /MJ) anhydrous
(g/tonne)	4.078	0.088	1.493	6.553	3,701	
(g/mmBtu)	2.222	0.048	0.814	3.571	2,017	2,087
(g/MJ)	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	2.0	2.0

SECTION 4. ETHANOL PRODUCTION

4.1 Ethanol Production

Like the sugar cane farming energy calculations, CA-GREET uses energy input values for sugar cane ethanol in Btu/gallon of anhydrous ethanol and uses fuel shares to allocate this direct energy input to process fuels. Part of the bagasse, the fiber material remaining after squeezing the juice of the plant, is currently burned at the mill to provide heat for distillation and electricity to run machinery at the plant. This allows ethanol plants to be energetically self-sufficient and even sell surplus electricity to utilities in some cases.

Note: A major portion of the energy used in sugarcane ethanol plant in Brazil is from bagasse (a fiber material of the sugar cane plant). Sucrose accounts for little more than 30% of the chemical energy stored in the mature plant; 35% is in the leaves and stem tips, which are left in the fields during harvest, and 35% are in the fibrous material (bagasse) left over from pressing.

Table 4.01 below shows the ethanol production fuel shares and energy inputs per gallon of anhydrous ethanol. The electricity input is represented in Btu/gal and added to the process fuel consumption to determine the fuel shares. Additional details are shown in Table 4.02.

Table 4.01. Sugar Cane Ethanol Fuel Shares and Primary Energy Inputs (Btu/gallon Anhydrous Ethanol)

Fuel Type	Fuel Share	Primary Energy Input (Btu/gallon)
Bagasse	99.65%	83,132
Residual Oil	0.35%	278
Total	100%	83,409

Note:

For Bagasse : $0.00642 \text{ dry tonne bagasse/gal ethanol} * 12,947,318 \text{ (Btu/tonne) LHV} = 83,132 \text{ Btu/gal}$
 For Residual oil: Oil use in sugarcane ethanol plants is from lubricant use. For CO₂ calculation, it is assumed that 10% of lubricants is burned.

Tables 4.02 and 4.03 below show the CA-GREET equations, parameters and energy inputs for ethanol production. The Tables show the total input energy per mmBtu of anhydrous ethanol. For this document, ethanol transported from Brazil is considered as anhydrous which is subsequently blended to make denatured ethanol in CA.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 4.02. Sugar Cane Ethanol Formulas, Parameters and Total Energy

Fuel Type	Formula	Relevant Parameters	Total Energy
Bagasse	Dry tonne bagasse/gal ethanol *Bagasse LHV	Dry tonne bagasse/gal ethanol = 0.00642 tonne/gal	83,132 (Btu/gal)
		Bagasse LHV = 12,947,318 Btu/tonne (CA-GREET default)	
Residual Oil	(Direct Residual Oil Input)* (1+(WTT Crude Oil Energy*Loss Factor + WTT of residual oil)/10 ⁶)	Direct residual oil input = 251 Btu/gal	284 (Btu/gal)
		WTT crude oil energy = 31,657 Btu/mmBtu	
		Loss Factor = 1	
		WTT of residual oil = 74,001Btu/mmBtu	
Total energy input for ethanol production (Btu/gal)			83,415 (Btu/gal)
Total energy input for ethanol production (Btu/mmBtu anhydrous ethanol)		83,415 Btu/gal / (76,330 Btu/gal) *10 ⁶ *1.001 Btu/mmBtu	1,093,376(Btu /mmBtu)

Note: 1.001 is the loss factor by CA-GREET default

4.2 GHG Emissions from Ethanol Production

Sugar cane mill ethanol production in Brazil is assumed here to use dry bagasse as fuel for small boilers (99.65%). A relatively small amount of residual oil is also utilized in the process (about 0.35%). GHG from ethanol production by burning bagasse is calculated based on the assumptions in Table 4.03 below and the results are shown in Table 4.04. The CO₂ emissions shown in Table 4.03 include the direct boiler emissions (118,834 g/mmBtu) of bagasse; residual oil emissions include emissions from an industrial boiler (85,045 g/mmBtu) and direct WTT residual oil use in the boiler. CO₂ is credited to the ethanol production process resulting from biomass (bagasse) burning.

Table 4.03. Process Shares and Emission Factors (EF) of Ethanol Production

EtOH Production Equipment and Fuel Used	% Shares of Equip. Usage	CO ₂ EF (g/mmBtu of fuel burned)	VOC EF	CO EF	CH ₄ EF	N ₂ O EF	Assumed % of Fuels used at the EtOH Plant	Direct Energy Use (Btu/gal)
Small industrial boiler (10-100mmBtu/hr input) to burn bagasse	100%	118,834	5.34	76.8	31.6	4.2	99.65%	83,132
Residual oil industrial boiler	10%	85,045	0.9	15.8	3.2	0.4	0.35%	284

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 4.04. Calculated GHG Emissions for Ethanol Production Using CO₂ Factors from Table 4.03

Calculations CO ₂ in g/gal			Conversion to g/mmBtu	Results g- CO ₂ e/mmBtu
Bagasse burning in EtOH Production				
CO ₂ Small industrial boiler	(Direct energy use of bagasse, Btu/gal) *(118,834 g/mmBtu)*1.001/10 ⁶	9,881	9,881 g/gal/(76,330 Btu/gal)*10 ⁶	129,519
CO ₂ credit from bagasse burning	Bagasse burning = -(0.00642 tonne/gal *46.3% carbon content *2000lbs/tonne*454 g/lbs)*44/12	-9,897	-9,897 g/gal/(76,330 Btu/gal)*10 ⁶	-129,732
EtOH Production				
CH ₄		34.52		963.5
N ₂ O		4.6		1,395
Total GHG EtOH Production (g CO₂e/mmBtu) (after converting CO and VOC to GHG)				2,021
Residual Oil				
CO ₂ of small industrial boiler	(Direct energy use of residual oil, Btu/gal) *10%* (85,045 g/mmBtu) /10 ⁶	2.1	(2.1 g/gal) /(76,330 Btu/gal)*10 ⁶	28.0
CO ₂ for WTT of crude oil	(Direct energy use of residual oil, Btu/gal) *10%* (3,260 g/mmBtu)*1/10 ⁶	0.1	(0.1 g/gal) /(76,330 Btu/gal)*10 ⁶	1.1
CO ₂ for WTT of residual oil	(Direct energy use of residual oil, Btu/gal) *10%* (5,607 g/mmBtu)/10 ⁶	0.1	(0.16 g/gal) /(76,330 Btu/gal)*10 ⁶	1.8
VOC	(Direct energy use of residual oil, Btu/gal)*(0.9 g/mmBtu) /10 ⁶	<0.01	(<0.01 g/gal)/ (76,330 Btu/gal)*(3.1)*10 ⁶	<0.01
CO	(Direct energy use of residual oil, Btu/gal) * (15.8 g/mmBtu) /10 ⁶	<0.01	(<0.01 g/gal)/ (76,330 Btu/gal)*(1.6)*10 ⁶	0.08
Total GHGs for Residual Oil (gCO₂e/mmBtu)				31.0
Total GHGs for ethanol production (gCO₂e/mmBtu)				2,021
Total GHGs for ethanol production (gCO₂e/MJ)				1.9

Note: Feed Loss Factor is assumed at 1. Small amounts of CH₄ and N₂O are negligible.

Carbon ratio of bagasse is 46.3% by CA-GREET default.

The 10% allocation of residual oil to ethanol is a CA-GREET default value. The 10% is to account for lubricating oil that is used not as a combustion source but is lost during the operation of the machinery involved in ethanol production. For this document, the lubricating oil is modeled as residual oil and its WTT emissions are used as a surrogate for lubricating oil.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

(This page intentionally left blank.)

SECTION 5. ETHANOL TRANSPORT AND DISTRIBUTION

5.1 Energy for Ethanol Transportation and Distribution

For CA-GREET pathway, the default sugarcane ethanol transport and distribution (T&D) from Brazil to the U.S is divided as follows:

- From ethanol plant in Brazil to U.S ports:
 - Inside Brazil: 50% by rail (500 miles) and 50% by pipeline (500 miles)
 - From Brazilian ports to U.S ports by ocean tanker (7,416 miles)
- From U.S ports to distribution centers inside U.S
 - 100% by Heavy Duty Truck (100 miles)
- For distribution within U.S
 - 80% by truck (50 miles)
 - 20% directly from ports to blending terminals

Instead of calculating the WTT values on a per tonne basis as CA-GREET does for the sugar cane transport component, CA-GREET calculates WTT energy required per mmBtu of fuel (anhydrous ethanol) transported. Table 5.01 below shows the major inputs used in calculating transport energy and Table 5.02 presents the CA-GREET formulas used to calculate the ethanol transport energy for each transport mode.

Table 5.01. Inputs and Calculated Energy Requirements for Ethanol Transport to Bulk Terminals

Transport	Mode	Energy Intensity (Btu/tonne-mile)	Distance from Origin to Destination (mi)	Capacity (tonnes)	Fuel Used (mi/gal)	Energy Used (Btu/mi for truck) (Btu/hp hr for ship)	Shares of Diesel Used	% Fuel Transported by Mode
Brazil Plant to Brazil port	Pipeline	253	500	110	n/a	n/a	20%	50%
	Rail	370	500	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%	50%
Brazil port to U.S port	Ocean Tanker	32	7,416	150,000	19	4,620	100%	100%
		29	7,416	150,000	19	4,691	100%	100%
U.S port to distribution center inside U.S	Heavy Duty Truck	1,028	100	33	5	25,690	100%	100%
Distribution to blending terminal inside U.S	Heavy Duty Truck	1,028	50	33	5	25,690	100%	80%

Note: Pipeline use 20% diesel, 6% electricity, 24% natural gas, the remaining 50% is residual oil. Ocean tanker travel from origin and back has different energy consumption. For ethanol distributed in the U.S, 20% ethanol is directly transported to blending terminal by CA-GREET default.

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Table 5.02. CA-GREET Calculations for Ethanol Transport Energy (Btu/mmBtu Anhydrous Ethanol) by Transport Mode

Transport Mode	CA-GREET Formula	Relevant Parameters	Btu/mmBtu
Transport Pipeline within Brazil	- 6% electricity use: $(10^6/A)*B)/((g/lb)*(lb/tonne)*(C)*(D)*[6%*(H)*100%]) = 440$ - 20% diesel use: $(10^6/A)*B)/((g/lb)*(lb/tonne)*(C)*(D)*[20%*100%*(1+(F))]) = 1,260$ - 50% residual oil: $(10^6/A)*B)/((g/lb)*(lb/tonne)*(C)*(D)*[50%*100%*(1+(G))]) = 3,010$ - 24% NG Use: $10^6/A)*B)/((g/lb)*(lb/tonne)*(C)*(D)*[24%*100%*(1+(K))]) = 1,402$	A = Ethanol LHV = 76,330 Btu/gal B = Ethanol density = 2,988 g/gal C = Mi traveled = 500 D = Energy intensity = 253 (Btu/tonne-mile) E = %Diesel Share = 20% F = Diesel energy = 0.157 Btu/Btu G = Residual oil energy = 0.106 Btu/Btu H = Electricity Energy in Brazil = 1.347 Btu/Btu K = NG energy = 0.073 Btu/Btu	6,202
Transport Rail within Brazil	100% diesel use: $10^6/A*B)/((g/lb)*(lb/tonne)*I*K*[E*(1+F)])$	I = Mi traveled = 500 J = % Electricity share = 0% K = Rail energy intensity = 370 Btu/tonne-mile	9,414
Transport Ocean Tanker to U.S ports	$10^6/A*B((g/lb)*(lb/tonne)*(L*(M+N)*100\%*(1+G))$	L = Mi travel = 7,416 miles M = energy intensity from origin = 32 Btu/tonne-mile N = energy intensity from destination = 29 Btu/tonne-mile	21,992
Total EtOH Transportation used in Brazil = 50%*6202 + 50%*9414 + 21992 =			29,800
Transport Within U.S	$10^6/A*B((g/lb)*(lb/tonne)*(O*(P+P)*100\%*(1+F))$	O = Mi travel = 100 miles P = energy intensity = 1,028	10,459
Total EtOH Transportation			40,259
Distribution	$10^6/A*B((g/lb)*(lb/tonne)*(Q*(P+P)*100\%*(1+F)*80\%$	Q = Mi traveled = 50 80% = shares of truck travel	4,183
T&D Total (Btu/mmBtu ethanol)			44,442

Note: The energy intensity for heavy duty trucks is multiplied by 2 to account for return trip.

5.2 GHG Calculations from Ethanol Transportation and Distribution

Similar to sugar cane T&D, ethanol T&D to bulk terminal is assumed in CA-GREET model by rail and pipeline inside Brazil, then ocean tanker from Brazilian ports to U.S. ports, and finally from trucks to terminal within U.S. All the key assumptions are the same as sugar cane T&D's and are shown in Table 5.03. The values in this table do not reflect the mode shares.

Table 5.03. Key Assumptions in Calculating GHG Emissions from EtOH Transportation

Transport Mode	Transport Fuel	1-way Energy Intensity (Btu/tonne-mile) (Values in parenthesis for return trip)	Distance from Origin to Destination (mi)	WTT Fuel CO ₂ Emissions of transportation fuels (g/mmBtu)	CO ₂ Emission Factors of Diesel Combustion (g/mmBtu)
50% Rail	Diesel	370	500	12,647	77,623
50% Pipeline	Electricity	253	500	18,504	-
	Diesel			12,647	Turbine: 78,179 Reciprocating Engine: 77,337
	Residual Oil			8,867	Turbine: 85,061 Reciprocating Engine: 84,219
	Natural Gas			5,218	Turbine: 58,044 Reciprocating Engine: 56,013
100% Ocean Tanker	Residual Oil	32 (29)	7,416	8,867	84,102
100% Heavy Duty Truck	Diesel	1,713	100	12,647	77,809 (77,913)
80% Heavy Duty Truck	Diesel	1,713	30	12,647	77,809 (77,913)

Note: It is assumed that all locomotives use diesel. Values in parenthesis are for the return trips

The results are shown below in Table 5.04. The WTT emissions shown in the Table for each GHG species is calculated in the T&D tab of CA-GREET. The equation for CO₂ from rail is shown below and the calculations for the other transport modes and GHG gases are done similarly. VOC and CO emissions are not shown in Table 5.04, which contribute 8.7 g/mmBtu and 18.6 g/mmBtu (on a CO₂-equivalent basis), respectively. CA-GREET also includes 19.7 g/mmBtu VOC fugitive emissions (62 g/mmBtu CO₂-

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

equivalent). Note that only one-way rail emissions are counted, whereas an extra term exists in the calculation for truck transport to account for the return truck trip; emissions from the return trip are assumed to be equal to emissions for the trip from the origin to destination.

Sample Calculation: Rail CO₂ emissions = (Ethanol density 2,988 g/gal)/(Ethanol LHV 76,330 Btu/gal)/[(454 g/lb)*(2,000 lbs/tonne)]*[(Diesel emission factor 77,623 g/Btu)+(Diesel WTT emissions 12,647 g/mmBtu)]*(370 Btu/tonne-mile)*(500 miles)*(50% mode share) = 360 g/mmBtu anhydrous ethanol (see Table 5.04).

Table 5.04. EtOH Transport and Distribution - CO₂e Emissions in g/mmBtu

Transport Mode	CO ₂ Emissions, Excluding VOC and CO (g/mmBtu)	CH ₄ Emissions (g/mmBtu)		N ₂ O Emissions (g/mmBtu)		CO ₂ e (g/mmBtu)
		actual	as CO ₂ e	actual	as CO ₂ e	
Transported by Pipeline	449	0.77	0.77*25=19	0.01	0.01*298=3	471
Transported by Rail	737	0.83	0.83*25=21	0.02	0.02*298=6	764
Transported by Ocean Tanker	1,856	1.97	1.97*25=49	0.04	0.04*298=12	1,917
	2,449*					3,152
Transported by Heavy Duty Truck	820	0.9	23	0.02	6	859
Distributed by Heavy Duty Truck	328	0.2	5	0.00	1	334
Total	3,597	3.9	98	0.1	24	4,345
Total (gCO₂e/MJ, anhydrous ethanol)						4.1

Note: *In Brazil, assumed 50% EtOH transportation travel by rail and 50% by truck

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

(This page intentionally left blank.)

APPENDIX B

ETHANOL PATHWAY INPUT VALUES (FROM BRAZIL SUGAR CANE)

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Scenario: Ethanol made in Brazil from Brazil sugar cane and transported to California.

Parameters	Units	Values	Note
GHG Equivalent			
CO ₂		1	
CH ₄		25	
N ₂ O		298	
VOC		3.1	
CO		1.6	
Sugar Cane Cultivation			
Fuel Use Shares			
<i>Diesel</i>		38.3%	
<i>Gasoline</i>		12.3%	
<i>Natural Gas</i>		21.5%	
<i>LPG</i>		18.8%	
<i>Electricity</i>		9%	
Cultivation Equipment Shares			
<i>Diesel Farming Tractor</i>		80%	
<i>CO₂ Emission Factor</i>	g/mmBtu	77,411	
<i>Diesel Engine</i>		20%	
<i>CO₂ Emission Factor</i>	g/mmBtu	77,349	
<i>Gasoline Farming Tractor</i>		80%	
<i>CO₂ Emission Factor</i>	g/mmBtu	75,645	
<i>NG Engine</i>		100%	
<i>CO₂ Emission Factor</i>	g/mmBtu	57,732	
<i>LPG Commercial Boiler</i>		100%	
<i>CO₂ Emission Factor</i>	g/mmBtu	68,036	
Sugar Cane Farming			
<i>Sugar Cane energy use</i>	Btu/tonne	41,592	
<i>Sugar Cane harvest yield</i>	lbs/tonne		
	tonne/acre		
<i>Land Use from Sugar cane farming</i>	g/tonne	195	
Sugar cane T&D			
<i>Transported from Sugar Cane Field to Stack</i>			
<i>by medium truck</i>	miles	10	2,199 Btu/mile-tonne Energy Intensity
<i>fuel consumption</i>	mi/gal	7.3	capacity 8 tonnes/trip
<i>CO₂ emission factor</i>	g/mi	1,369	
<i>Transported from Stack to EtOH Plant</i>			
<i>by heavy duty diesel truck</i>	miles	40	1,713 Btu/mile-tonne Energy Intensity
<i>fuel consumption</i>	mi/gal	5	capacity 15 tonnes/trip
<i>CO₂ emission factor</i>	g/mi	1,999	
Chemicals Inputs			
Nitrogen	g/tonne	1,092	
<i>NH₃</i>			
<i>Production Efficiency</i>		82.4%	
<i>Shares in Nitrogen Production</i>		70.7%	
<i>CO₂ Emission Factor</i>	g/g	2.475	
<i>Urea</i>			

DRAFT – FOR REVIEW

Parameters	Units	Values	Note
Production Efficiency		46.7%	
Shares in Nitrogen Production		21.1%	
<i>Ammonium Nitrate</i>			
Production Efficiency		35%	
Shares in Nitrogen Production		8%	
P₂O₅	g/tonne	149	
<i>H₃PO₄</i>			
Feedstock input	tonnes	n/a	
<i>H₂SO₄</i>			
Feedstock input	tonnes	2,674	
<i>Phosphor Rock</i>			
Feedstock input	tonnes	3,525	
K₂O	g/tonne	193.6	
CaCO₃	g/tonne	5,337.7	
Herbicide	g/tonne	8.1	
Pesticide	g/tonne	2.21	
CO₂ from CaCO₃ use	g/tonne	2,349	
Sugar Can Straw Burning Credit	g/tonne	-349,067	
EtOH Production			
Yield			
EtOH Yield	gal/wet tonne	24	
Sugar Cane Straw Yield	Dry tonne/tonne sugar cane	0.19	CA-GREET Default
Bagasse Burning/gal EtOH Yield	Dry tonne/gal	0.00642	CA-GREET Default
Production			
Energy use for Sugar Cane Mill EtOH	Btu/gal	251	CA-GREET Default
From Residual Oil		0.3%	
Residual Oil Industrial Boiler	g/mmBtu	85,045	CA-GREET Default
From Bagasse burning		99.7%	
Bagasse –burned, small Industrial Boiler	g/mmBtu	118,834	CA-GREET Default
EtOH T&D			
Transported by rail – inside Brazil	miles	500	370 Btu/mile-tonne Energy Intensity
Transported by pipeline – inside Brazil	miles	500	253 Btu/mile-tonne Energy Intensity
Transported by Ocean Tanker to U.S.	miles	7,416	26 Btu/mile-tonne Energy Intensity from original
From U.S. back to Brazil	miles	7,416	39 Btu/mile-tonne Energy Intensity from destination
Transported by HHD truck to distribution center	miles	100	1,028 Btu/mile-tonne Energy Intensity both ways
Transported by HHD truck to blending terminal	Miles	50	1,028 Btu/mile-tonne Energy Intensity both ways
Fuels Properties	LHV (Btu/gal)	Density (g/gal)	
Crude	129,670	3,205	CA-GREET Default
Residual Oil	140,353	3,752	CA-GREET Default
Conventional Diesel	128,450	3,167	CA-GREET Default
Conventional Gasoline	116,090	2,819	CA-GREET Default
CaRFG	111,289	2,828	CA-GREET Default
CARBOB	113,300	2,767	CA-GREET Default
Natural Gas	83,868	2,651	As liquid
EtOH	76,330	2,988	Anhydrous ethanol (neat)
EtOH	77,254	2,983	Denatured ethanol (2.5% by volume)
Bagasse (Btu/dry tonne)	12,947,318	n/a	CA-GREET Default